



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/650,891	08/28/2003	Ciprian Gociman	MS1-1684US	8737
22801	7590	11/19/2008		
LEE & HAYES PLLC 601 W Riverside Avenue Suite 1400 SPOKANE, WA 99201			EXAMINER ABRISHAMKAR, KAVEH	
			ART UNIT 2431	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 11/19/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/650,891	Applicant(s) GOCIMAN, CIPRIAN	
	Examiner KAVEH ABRISHAMKAR	Art Unit 2431	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 September 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/12/08, 6/2/08</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on September 4, 2008. Claims 1-38 were originally pending consideration. Per the received amendment, claims 1-2, 10, 13, 20-23 and 31-34 are amended.
2. Claims 1-38 are currently pending consideration.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on September 4, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the following reasons:

Regarding the independent claims 1, 13, 23, and 34, the Applicant argues that the Cited Prior Art (CPA), Lortz (U.S. Patent 7,107,610), does not teach the limitation "the administrative authority being independent of whether the user is a member of an administrator's group associated with any resource of the server." This argument is not found persuasive. The Applicant points to the passage in Lortz which discloses four different authorizations levels, and states equates the Owner level with the administrative authority. However, the claim language states that "user" is the one that was delegated the credentials and not the one delegating the credentials. Lortz discloses these four authorization levels, but they correspond to the first client (Lortz: column 2, lines 10-14). The first client delegates the credentials to a second client (equivalent of the user in the Applicant's claim language), which can access the server with the same authority as the first client (Lortz: column 2, lines 10-14). This second

client's authority is independent of whether the user is a member of an administrator's group associated with any resource of the server, as it only depends on the delegating client's credentials.

Therefore, the Applicant arguments are not persuasive, and the rejection for the claims is maintained as given below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-3, 5, 7-10, 12-14, 16, 18-20, 22-25, 27, 29-31, 33-35, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lortz (U.S. Patent 7,107,610).

Regarding claim 1, Lortz discloses:

A method of use by a server coupled to one or more client devices in a distributed computing environment, the method comprising:

hosting a set of resources (column 2, lines 35-41: "*resource manager*");

receiving a request for a user to perform an operation on a resource of the resources, the request being received by an application hosted by the server (column 1, line 65 - column 2, line 9), *wherein a client generates a resource request over the network to access the resources*; and

determining whether to authorize the operation as a function of whether the user has been delegated administrative authority to perform the operation with respect to the resource, the administrative authority being independent of whether the user is a member of an administrators group associated with any resource of the server (column 2, lines 10-14), *wherein a client can delegate its authorization credentials to a second client which can then use those credentials to access the server*.

Claim 2 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Lortz discloses:

A method as recited in claim 1, wherein determining whether to authorize the operation is performed by a secure delegation administration framework (column 2, lines 10-14), *wherein a client can delegate its authorization credentials*.

Claim 3 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Lortz discloses:

A method as used in claim 1, wherein the operation is associated with modification of content and/or functionality of the resource (column 1, lines 45-52), *wherein the client is associated with a resource operation*.

Claim 5 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Lortz discloses:

A method as recited in claim 1, wherein the request comprises a scope associated with the user, and a name of a method associated with the operation (column 1, line 65 – column 2, line 9), *wherein the resource request includes the authorization credentials for the client.*

Claim 7 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Lortz discloses:

A method as recited in claim 1, wherein the request further comprises an indication of whether the user desires to execute the operation via a dynamically built command line or via an executable object already associate with the operation (column 1, lines 45-52), *wherein a client is associated with a resource operation.*

Claim 8 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Lortz discloses:

A method as recited in claim 1, wherein the request further comprises an indication of whether the user desires to log a result of the operation (column 1, lines 45-52), *wherein a client is associated with a resource operation, which can include accessing a file.*

Claim 9 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Lortz discloses:

A method as recited in claim 1, wherein the secure delegation administration framework is secure at least because it does not allow the user access to mapping of user role-based permission to perform the operation directed to the resource (column 2, lines 35-43, column 3, lines 19-23), *wherein the user has no control over the mapping but the resource manager does the mapping of the resource requests.*

Claim 10 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Lortz discloses:

A method as recited in claim 1, wherein the method further comprises:
installing the application on the server (column 2, lines 35-37), *wherein a resource manager is a program module installed on the server;*
responsive to the installing, the application identifying a set of operations that the application can perform (column 2, lines 15-19, 51-56), *wherein the resources that a server manages is determined;*
mapping, by a member of the administrators group, the operations to a set of security permissions based on authorization specific role(s) of a set of users comprising the user (column 1, lines 39-44), *wherein each client is associated (mapped) to authorization credentials which represent the privilege level that the client is assigned;*
and

Art Unit: 2431

wherein determining further comprises the application utilizing the mapping to identify whether the user has permission to perform the operation (column 2, lines 35-50), *wherein the authorization credentials accompanying the resource request are mapped to a certain access level, so that the server can check if the client is authorized to access the requested resource.*

Claim 12 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Lortz discloses:

A method as recited in claim 1, wherein responsive to determining that the user has been delegated authority to perform the operation with respect to the resource, the method further comprises:

setting parameters associated with the operation (column 1, lines 45-50); and
executing the operation within a scope associate with the user (column 1, lines 39-44), *wherein each client is associated (mapped) to authorization credentials which represent the privilege level that the client is assigned in regards to the resource.*

Regarding claim 13, Lortz discloses:

A computer-readable medium for use in a distributed computing environment including a server and one or more client computing devices coupled to the server, the computer-readable medium comprising computer-executable instructions than, when executed, cause one or more processors to perform acts including :

hosting a set of resources(column 2, lines 35-41: "*resource manager*"), a particular resource of the resources allowing a user to determine whether the user has delegated authority to access a resource of the resources (column 1, line 65 – column 2, line 9), *wherein the resource request includes the authorization credentials for the client;*

receiving a request from the user to perform an operation on the resource (column 1, line 65 - column 2, line 9), *wherein a client generates a resource request over the network to access the resources;* and

determining whether to authorize the operation as a function of whether the user has been delegated a role-based scope of authority to perform the operation, the role-based scope of authority not requiring the user to be a member of an administrators group associated with any resources of the server (column 2, lines 10-14), *wherein a client can delegate its authorization credentials to a second client which can then use those credentials to access the server.*

Claim 14 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 13. Furthermore, Lortz discloses:

A computer-readable medium as recited in claim 13, wherein the operation is associated with modification of content and/or functionality of the resource (column 1, lines 45-52), *wherein the client is associated with a resource operation.*

Art Unit: 2431

Claim 16 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 13. Furthermore, Lortz discloses:

A computer-readable medium as recited in claim 13, wherein the request comprises a scope associated with the user, and a name of a method associated with the operation (column 1, line 65 – column 2, line 9), *wherein the resource request includes the authorization credentials for the client.*

Claim 18 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 13. Furthermore, Lortz discloses:

A computer-readable medium as recited in claim 13, wherein the request further comprises an indication of whether the operation is to be executed via a dynamically built command line or via an executable object already associated with the operation (column 1, lines 45-52), *wherein a client is associated with a resource operation.*

Claim 19 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 13. Furthermore, Lortz discloses:

A computer-readable medium as recited in claim 13, wherein operations associated with determining whether to authorize the operations are secure at least because the user does not have access to user role-based permission(s) to perform the operation (column 2, lines 35-43, column 3, lines 19-23), *wherein the user has no control over the mapping but the resource manager does the mapping of the resource requests.*

Claim 20 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 13. Furthermore, Lortz discloses:

A computer-readable medium as recited in claim 13, wherein the computer-executable instructions comprise instructions that cause the one or more processors to perform acts further including:

identifying a set of operations associated with the resource (column 2, lines 15-19, 51-56), *wherein the resources that a server manages is determined;*

mapping the operations to a set of security permissions, the security permissions being based on authorization specific role(s) of a set of users comprising the user (column 1, lines 39-44), *wherein each client is associated (mapped) to authorization credentials which represent the privilege level that the client is assigned;* and

wherein the instructions for determining further comprise instructions for utilizing the mapping to identify whether the user has permission to perform the operation (column 2, lines 35-50), *wherein the authorization credentials accompanying the resource request are mapped to a certain access level, so that the server can check if the client is authorized to access the requested resource.*

Claim 22 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 13. Furthermore, Lortz discloses:

A computer-readable medium as recited in claim 13, wherein the computer-executable instructions, responsive to determining that the user has been delegated

Art Unit: 2431

authority to perform the operation with respect to the resource, comprise instructions that cause the one or more processors to perform acts further including:

setting parameters associated with the operation (column 1, lines 45-50); and
executing the operation within a scope associated with the user (column 1, lines 39-44), *wherein each client is associated (mapped) to authorization credentials which represent the privilege level that the client is assigned in regards to the resource.*

Regarding claim 23, Lortz discloses:

A server for use in a distributed computing environment including the server and one or more client computing devices coupled to the server, the server comprising:

one or more processors (column 2, lines 35-41: "*resource manager*");; and
a memory coupled to the one or more processors, the memory comprising computer-executable instructions that cause the one or more processors to perform acts including:

hosting a set of resources(column 2, lines 35-41: "*resource manager*");;
receiving a request from a user to perform an operation on a resource of the resources (column 1, line 65 – column 2, line 9), *wherein the resource request includes the authorization credentials for the client;* and

determining whether to authorize the operation as a function of whether the user has been delegated a role-based scope of authority to perform the operation, the role-based scope of authority not requiring the user to be a member of an administrators group associated with resources of the server (column 2, lines 10-14), *wherein a client*

Art Unit: 2431

can delegate its authorization credentials to a second client which can then use those credentials to access the server.

Claim 24 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 23. Furthermore, Lortz discloses:

A server as recited in claim 23, wherein the request is generated by at least one resource of the resources (column 1, line 65 – column 2, line 9), *wherein the resource request includes the authorization credentials for the client.*

Claim 25 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 23. Furthermore, Lortz discloses:

A server as recited in claim 23, wherein the operation is associated with modification of content and/or functionality of the resource (column 1, lines 45-52), *wherein the client is associated with a resource operation.*

Claim 27 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 23. Furthermore, Lortz discloses:

A server as recited in claim 23, wherein the request comprises a scope associated with the user, a name of a method associated with the operation (column 1, line 65 – column 2, line 9), *wherein the resource request includes the authorization credentials for the client.*

Art Unit: 2431

Claim 29 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 23. Furthermore, Lortz discloses:

A server as recited in claim 23, wherein the request further comprises an indication of whether the operation is to be executed via a dynamically built command line or via an executable object already associated with the operation (column 1, lines 45-52), *wherein a client is associated with a resource operation.*

Claim 30 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 23. Furthermore, Lortz discloses:

A server as recited in claim 23, wherein the secure delegation administration framework is secure at least because it does not allow the user access to a mapping of user role-based permission to perform the operation directed to the resource (column 2, lines 35-43, column 3, lines 19-23), *wherein the user has no control over the mapping but the resource manager does the mapping of the resource requests.*

Claim 31 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 23. Furthermore, Lortz discloses:

A server as recited in claim 23, wherein the computer-executable instructions further comprise instructions that cause the one or more processors to perform acts further including:

identifying a set of operations associated with the resource (column 2, lines 15-19, 51-56), *wherein the resources that a server manages is determined;*

mapping the operations to a set of security permissions based on authorization specific role(s) of a set of users comprising the user (column 1, lines 39-44), *wherein each client is associated (mapped) to authorization credentials which represent the privilege level that the client is assigned; and*

wherein the instructions for determining further comprise instructions for utilizing the mapping to identify whether the user has permission to perform the operation column 2, lines 35-50), *wherein the authorization credentials accompanying the resource request are mapped to a certain access level, so that the server can check if the client is authorized to access the requested resource.*

Claim 33 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 23. Furthermore, Lortz discloses:

A server as recited in claim 23, wherein the computer-executable instructions, responsive to determining that the user has been delegated authority to perform the operation with respect to the resource, further comprise instructions that cause the one or more processors to perform acts further including:

setting parameters associated with the operation (column 1, lines 45-50); and
executing the operation within a scope associated with the user (column 1, lines 39-44), *wherein each client is associated (mapped) to authorization credentials which represent the privilege level that the client is assigned in regards to the resource.*

Regarding claim 34, Lortz discloses:

Art Unit: 2431

A server comprising:

means for hosting a set of resources (column 2, lines 35-41: *"resource manager"*);

means for receiving a request from the user to perform an operation on a resource of the resources (column 1, line 65 - column 2, line 9), *wherein a client generates a resource request over the network to access the resources*; and

means for determining whether to authorize the operation as a function of whether the user has been delegated a role-based scope of authority to perform the operation, the role-based scope of authority not requiring the user to be a member of an administrators group associated with the server (column 2, lines 10-14), *wherein a client can delegate its authorization credentials to a second client which can then use those credentials to access the server*.

Claim 35 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 34. Furthermore, Lortz discloses:

A server as recited in claim 34, wherein the operation is associated with modification of content and/or functionality of the resource (column 1, lines 45-52), *wherein the client is associated with a resource operation*.

Claim 38 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 34. Furthermore, Lortz discloses:

A server as recited in claim 34, wherein responsive to determining that the user has been delegated authority to perform the operation with respect to the resource, the server further comprises:

means for setting parameters associated with the operation (column 1, lines 45-50); and

means for executing the operation within a scope associated with the user (column 1, lines 39-44), *wherein each client is associated (mapped) to authorization credentials which represent the privilege level that the client is assigned in regards to the resource.*

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6,11,15,17,21,26,28,32 and 36-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lortz (U.S. Patent 7,107,610) in view of Krishnan et al. (U.S. Patent 6,222,856).

Claims 4, 15, 26, and 36 are rejected as applied above in rejecting the claims above. Lortz does not explicitly teach that the resource is an Internet Information Service (IIS) metabase node. Krishnan discloses a IIS system which uses a metabase

Art Unit: 2431

to obtain information about any virtual service (Krishnan: column 6, lines 37-46). Lortz and Krishnan are analogous arts because both have to do with controlling resources via a server. It would have been obvious to use the IIS metabase of Krishnan in the resource authorization framework of Lortz so the authorization framework of Lortz can use the metabase of Krishnan to look up names of virtual services, and their bandwidth thresholds, so that it can more efficiently authorize requests and reduce network congestion (Krishnan: column 6, lines 35-47).

Claims 6, 17, 28, and 37 are rejected as applied above in rejecting the claims above. Lortz teaches a server and that a client cannot perform administrative activities associated with the server without sending a request to the server for permission evaluation (Lortz: column 1, line 65 - column 2, line 9). Lortz does not explicitly teach that the resources that are to be accessed are Web sites hosted by an ISP. Krishnan discloses that a network server is an ISP that provides services to a client over the Internet (Krishnan: column 4, lines 23-37). It would have been obvious for the network server of Lortz to be an ISP hosting Web sites, as the system of Lortz is over the Internet, and ISPs are ubiquitous throughout the Internet.

Claims 11, 21, and 32 are rejected as applied in rejecting the claims above. Furthermore, Lortz discloses:

specifying, by a member of a administrators group, role-based user access permissions to nodes (column 2, lines 35-50), *wherein the authorization credentials*

accompanying the resource request are mapped to a certain access level, so that the server can check if the client is authorized to access the requested resource;

indicating an interface to a task, the interface comprising a set of parameters and a name (column 1, line 65 – column 2, line 9), *wherein the resource request includes the authorization credentials for the client*, the task comprising the operation; and

wherein determining further comprises:

locating the interface in a configuration file (column 2, lines 45-50), *wherein the service searches the resource structure to find the client's information (configuration file) to check if the client's request should be granted;*

responsive to locating the interface, presenting an identity of the user to the resource to evaluate a scope in view of the parameters and the name of the resource (column 1, line 65 – column 2, line 9), *wherein the resource request includes the authorization credentials for the client;* and

responsive to the presenting, identifying whether the user has been delegated a role-based access permission to perform the operation with respect to the resource server (column 2, lines 10-14), *wherein a client can delegate its authorization credentials to a second client which can then use those credentials to access the server.*

Lortz does not explicitly teach that the resource is an Internet Information Service (IIS) metabase node. Krishnan discloses a IIS system which uses a metabase to obtain information about any virtual service (Krishnan: column 6, lines 37-46). Lortz and

Art Unit: 2431

Krishnan are analogous arts because both have to do with controlling resources via a server. It would have been obvious to use the IIS metabase of Krishnan in the resource authorization framework of Lortz so the authorization framework of Lortz can use the metabase of Krishnan to look up names of virtual services, and their bandwidth thresholds, so that it can more efficiently authorize requests and reduce network congestion (Krishnan: column 6, lines 35-47).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KAVEH ABRISHAMKAR whose telephone number is (571)272-3786. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8-5.

Art Unit: 2431

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kaveh Abrishamkar/
Examiner, Art Unit 2431

/K. A./
11/15/2008
Examiner, Art Unit 2431